

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated February 10, 2005, Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 17-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections.

Applicant has reviewed Claims 17-21 and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the restriction requirement. Claim 17 is very similar to Claim 1 with more structure as to the coupler and "within a vehicle." After reviewing the primary reference cited by the Examiner, it is clear that the vehicular lighting area was addressed. The *Scifres* reference is within the vehicular lighting area. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the restriction of Claims 17-21.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being clearly anticipated by *Scifres* (6,152,588). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 has been amended to highlight the differences between the present invention and the *Scifres* reference. Claim 1 is directed to a lighting system that includes a plurality of light sources each generating light, an optical fiber, and a light coupler optically coupling light from the light sources into the optical fiber. Applicant has replaced the word "to" with "into" to highlight that light is coupled from the light source into the optical fiber through the coupler. Also, as previously recited in the claim the coupler is formed of a body. Applicant has highlighted the fact that the body is monolithic body with the lenslets formed therein. Each of the lenslets corresponds to a respective light source. Each lenslet directs the light through the monolithic body to the optical fiber. Applicant has reviewed the *Scifres* reference and in particular Figure 11. Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion of a monolithic light coupler. Although some type of coupling device is set forth for coupling the light from the light sources into a fiber, no teaching or suggestion is provided for a monolithic body having lenslets therein.

Applicant also directs the Examiner to the Background of the invention which states that it is often difficult to form light couplers. The monolithic structure has the advantage of being easy to manufacture and thus less expensive to implement. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claim 10 is directed to the monolithic body structure of the coupler. As mentioned above, no monolithic structure having lenslets is taught or suggested in the *Scifres* reference. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

Claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, and 16 are dependent from Claims 1 and 10 and therefore are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 6-7, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scifres*. These claims are dependent upon their base claims which are believed to be allowable as set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of these claims as well.

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 50-0476.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

Kevin G. Mierzwinski
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: _____

5/10/05